

REMARKS

The Office Action of September 15, 2004 has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the claims have been amended as set forth above. Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

A more descriptive title has been provided as requested.

Replacement sheets of drawing are submitted herewith, wherein in Figs. 1-3 suitable legends have been provided.

Claim 4 was rejected as being indefinite. The claim has been amended and is now believed to be definite.


Claims 1-6 were rejected as being unpatentable over Hauck. The claims have been amended to more clearly distinguish over the cited reference. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In particular, the claims have been amended to recite that more than one instruction is implemented with the same device configuration (Page 9, lines 26-32).

Hauck is not believed to teach or suggest such a feature.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-6 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: January 11, 2005